Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 231 Filed 07/07/06 Page 1 of 6

E-filed 7/7/06

- 1			L-med ////oo		
1	TERRY T. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 121569 STEVEN D. GUGGENHEIM, State Bar No. 201	386			
2	KRISTIN A. DILLEHAY, State Bar No. 187257 CAMERON P. HOFFMAN, State Bar No. 22931				
3	MARK T. OAKES, State Bar No. 234598 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI				
4	Professional Corporation 650 Page Mill Road				
5	Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050 Telephone: (650) 493-9300				
6	Facsimile: (650) 565-5100 Email: moakes@wsgr.com				
7					
8	Attorneys for the Redback Defendants				
9					
10	UNITED STATES I	DISTI	RICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13	IN RE:)	CASE NO.: C-03-5642 JF (HRL)		
14	REDBACK NETWORKS, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION.))	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING BRIEFING		
15)	SCHEDULE AND PAGE LIMITS		
16	This Document Relates to:)			
17	ALL ACTIONS.)			
18)			
19)			
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND PAGE LIMITS; CASE NO. C-03-5642 JF (HRL)

1

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

11

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

STIPULATION

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2006, the Court entered an Order dismissing plaintiffs' third amended consolidated complaint and granting plaintiffs leave to amend (the "Order");

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Order, plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Consolidated Complaint for Violation of the Federal Securities Laws (the "Complaint") was filed on May 19, 2006;

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2006 the Court entered an Order pursuant to which defendants' motions to dismiss the Complaint are due to be filed on July 7, 2006, plaintiffs' oppositions to any motions to dismiss the Complaint are due to be filed on August 4, 2006, and defendants' replies in further support of their motions to dismiss the Complaint are due to be filed on August 25, 2006;

WHEREAS, the parties have agreed to amend the briefing schedule, without altering the hearing date;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-2(b) provides for a twenty-five (25) page limit on any motion and supporting memorandum of points and authorities filed in this action;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-3(a) provides for a twenty-five (25) page limit on any opposition to any motion filed in this action;

WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-3(c) provides for a fifteen (15) page limit on any reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of any motion filed in this action;

WHEREAS, in order to promote the interests of judicial efficiency, defendants Kevin DeNuccio, Pierre Lamond, Thomas Cronan, Vinod Khosla, Dennis Wolf, Vivek Ragavan, Dennis Barsema, Gaurav Garg, William Kurtz, Craig Gentner, Promod Haque and Randall Kruep (collectively, the "Redback Defendants") intend to file a joint motion to dismiss the Complaint;

WHEREAS, given the complexity of the Complaint, as well as the complexity of the law governing the allegations in the Complaint, and given that each of the Redback Defendants would be entitled to file a separate, twenty-five (25) page motion to dismiss and supporting memorandum of points and authorities, and a separate fifteen (15) page reply memorandum of points and authorities pursuant to the Local Rules, the Redback Defendants believe it is

appropriate to permit them to file a joint motion and supporting memoranda of points and authorities in excess of the twenty-five (25) and fifteen (15) page limits provided by the Local Rules;

WHEREAS, the Redback Defendants believe that they will need no more than thirty-five (35) pages for their memorandum of points and authorities in support of their joint motion to dismiss, and no more than a twenty (20) pages for their reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of their motion to dismiss; and

WHEREAS, plaintiffs are not opposed to the page limits proposed by the Redback Defendants.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned, subject to approval of the Court, that:

- 1. The Redback Defendants shall have until and including July 10, 2006 to serve and file any motions to dismiss the Complaint.
- 2. Plaintiffs shall have until and including August 7, 2006 to serve and file any oppositions to defendants' motions to dismiss.
- 3. Defendants shall have until and including August 25, 2006 to serve and file any replies in support of their motions to dismiss.
- 4. The case management conference and the hearing on defendants' motion to dismiss shall remain set for September 15, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.
- 5. The Redback Defendants' memorandum of points and authorities in support of their joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), but may not exceed a total of thirty-five (35) pages, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.
- 6. Plaintiffs' opposition to the Redback Defendants' joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), but may not exceed a total of thirty-five (35) pages, exclusive of caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits. Plaintiffs may separately file an opposition to any motion to dismiss filed by any other defendant (such as PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP) and those page

Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 231 Filed 07/07/06 Page 4 of 6

1	limits will not count toward the 35 page limit discussed herein; alternatively, Plaintiffs may file				
2	one omnibus brief in opposition to all motions to dismiss, and such opposition shall be no more				
3	than the combined total of the pages (exclusive of caption page, tables of contents and				
4	authorities, declarations and exhibits) of the defendants' motions to dismiss.				
5	7. The Redback Defendants' reply memorandum of points and authorities in further				
6	support of their joint motion to dismiss the operative complaint may exceed the fifteen (15) page				
7	limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(c), but may not exceed a total of twenty (20) pages,				
8	exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.				
9					
10	Dated: July 6, 2006	WILSON SONSINI GO Professional Corporatio			
11		Troressional Corporatio	11		
12		By: /s/ Mark T. Oakes Terry T. Johnson			
13		Steven D. Guggenl Kristin A. Dillehay	neim		
14		Cameron P. Hoffm Mark T. Oakes	an		
15		Attorneys for the Redba	nck Defendants		
16		Theorneys for the reduce	on Derendunts		
17	Dated: July 6, 2006	GRANT & EISENHOF	TER P.A.		
18	By: /s/ John C. Kairis				
19					
20		Kimberly L. Wierz	el		
21		Attorneys for Lead Plain	ntiff		
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER RE BRIEFING	-3-	C:\NrPortbl\PALIB1\MO2\2911130_1.DOC		

1

[PROPOSED] ORDER

2

Upon stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing:

3 4

1. The Redback Defendants shall have until and including July 10, 2006 to serve and file any motions to dismiss the Complaint.

5

2. Plaintiffs shall have until and including August 7, 2006 to serve and file any oppositions to defendants' motions to dismiss.

7

6

3. Defendants shall have until and including August 25, 2006 to serve and file any replies in support of their motions to dismiss.

9

10

8

4. The case management conference and the hearing on defendants' motions to dismiss shall remain set for September 15, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

11

12

5. The Redback Defendants' memorandum of points and authorities in support of their joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five (25) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-2(b), but may not exceed a total of thirty-five (35) pages, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.

13 14

15

16

6. Plaintiffs' opposition to the Redback Defendants' joint motion to dismiss the Complaint may exceed the twenty-five page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), but may not exceed a total of thirty-five (35) pages, exclusive of caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits. Plaintiffs may separately file an opposition to any motion to dismiss filed by any other defendant (such as PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP) and those page

17 18

19 20

limits will not count toward the 35 page limit discussed herein.

22

21

7.

The Redback Defendants' reply memorandum of points and authorities in further support of their joint motion to dismiss the operative complaint may exceed the fifteen (15) page limit imposed by Civil Local Rule 7-3(c), but may not exceed a total of twenty (20) pages,

23 24

exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities, declarations and exhibits.

25

IT IS SO ORDERED. 7/7/06 Dated:

26

THE HONOR ABLE JEREMY FOGEL United States District Judge

27

Case 5:03-cv-05642-JF Document 231 Filed 07/07/06 Page 6 of 6

1	I, Mark T. Oakes, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to				
2	file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Page Limits. In compliance with General				
3	Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that John Kairis has concurred in this filing.				
4	4 Dated: July 6, 2006 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSAT Professional Corporation	ľ			
5					
6	By: <u>/s/ Mark T. Oakes</u> Mark T. Oakes				
7	Attorneys for the Redback Defendants				
8					
9	9				
10	0				
11	1				
12	2				
13	3				
14	4				
15	5				
16	6				
17	7				
18	8				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
2728					
∠o I	0				